

COPY OF PAPERS **ORIGINALLY FILED**

In re application of Ulrich Khan et al.

Group Art Unit:1614

Serial No.:

09/485,292

Filed: 3 May 2000

NEW EPOTHIOLONE DERIVATIVES, PROCESS FOR THEIR For:

PRODUCTION, AND THEIR PHARMACEUTICAL USE

RECEIVED

JUN 2 1 2002

TECH CENTER 1600/2900

RESPONSE TO ELECTION OF SPECIES

Assistant Commissioner for Patents Washington, D.C. 20231

Sir:

In response to the Office Action mailed 5 December 2001, and the requirement for an election of species therein, applicants hereby elect the species of Example 1 disclosed on page 182 of the specification which corresponds to the first compound of claim 8 (i.e., (4S, 7R, 8S, 9S, 13Z, 16S (E))-4,8-dihyroxy-7-ethyl-16-(1-methyl-2-(2-methyl-4-thiazolyl) ethenyl)-1-oxa-5,5,9,13-tetramethyl-cyclohexadec-13-ene-2,6-dione (A).

The examiner is encouraged to examine the broadest possible scope of invention indicated by the elected species.

In accordance with M.P.E.P. §803.02, the examiner is reminded that, should no prior art be found which renders the invention of the elected species unpatentable, the search of the remainder of the generic claim(s) should be continued in the same application. It is improper for the PTO to refuse to examine in one application the entire scope of the claims therein unless they lack unity of invention. The generic claims herein have not been alleged to lack unity of invention.

Favorable action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

John A. Sopp Reg. No. 33,103

Jennifer Branigan, Reg. No. 40,921

Patent Agent

MILLEN, WHITE, ZELANO & BRANIGAN, P.C. Arlington Courthouse Plaza 1, Suite 1400 2200 Clarendon Boulevard Arlington, Virginia 22201

Telephone: (703) 243-6333 Facsimile: (703) 243-6410

Attorney Docket No.: SCH-1714A

Date: 5 June 2002

jjb:K:\Sch\1722\Response to Election of Species.doc